REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 20-22 and 31-43 are now in the case.

Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to clarify that the protective layer is durable. Support for this amendment is found, at least, on page 3, first paragraph of Applicants' specification. Claims 31-43 have been added. Support for this amendment is found, at least, in original claims 4-16.

Response to the Office Action

The Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Norman et al.

Claims 1-2 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Norman et al. (U.S. Patent 4,347,266). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. The reference does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness since it does not teach or suggest all of Applicants' claim limitations (see MPEP 2143.03). Specifically, Norman et al. do not teach or suggest applying a coating composition to a surface that forms a durable protective layer. Norman et al. disclose a temporary coating that is removed with water, leaving behind an unprotected surface. In Norman, the dirt or overspray is removed by dissolving the temporary coating. This is different from the present invention, wherein the surface remains protected after cleaning. This requirement is reflected in Applicants' claim 1 in two places. First, the coating composition forms a durable protective coating. "Durable" is defined in Webster's Third New International Dictionary as "able to exist for a long time with retention of original qualities, abilities or capabilities." Norman et al's coating is temporary and will not "exist for a long time," since it rinses off with water. On its intended surface, a car, the Norman coating would only last until the first rain storm or car wash. Secondly, Applicants' claim 1 requires that soil or stain is removed from the coated surface using a cleaning treatment. Norman et al. do not remove soil or stain from a coated surface. They remove the coating itself, leaving behind an uncoated surface. Since Norman et al. do not teach or suggest creating a durable protective layer in their patent, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established. As a result, Applicants contend that their claimed process is novel and unobvious and that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) should be withdrawn.

The Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Norman et al. in view of Shank

Claim 21 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Norman et al. in view of Shank (U.S. Patent 6,478,880). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. The

references do not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness since they do not teach or suggest all of Applicants' claim limitations (see MPEP 2143.03). Specifically, the combination of Norman et al. and Shank do not teach or suggest applying a coating composition to a surface that forms a durable protective layer. Therefore, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established.

As stated above, the Norman et al. reference discloses a temporary coating that is removed with water, leaving behind an unprotected surface. This does not teach or suggest Applicants' claimed invention, which requires applying a coating composition to a surface that forms a durable protective layer. The Shank reference does not supply this missing element. Since the combination of Norman et al. and Shank do not teach or suggest creating a durable protective layer in their patent, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established. As a result, Applicants contend that their claimed process is novel and unobvious and that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) should be withdrawn.

The Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Norman et al. in view of Shank and Silvani et al.

Claim 22 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Norman et al. in view of Shank and Silvani et al. (U.S. Patent 6,262,006). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. The references do not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness since they do not teach or suggest all of Applicants' claim limitations (see MPEP 2143.03). Specifically, the combination of Norman et al., Shank and Silvani et al. do not teach or suggest applying a coating composition to a surface that forms a durable protective layer. Therefore, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established.

As stated above, the Norman et al. reference discloses a temporary coating that is removed with water, leaving behind an unprotected surface. This does not teach or suggest Applicants' claimed invention, which requires applying a coating composition to a surface that forms a durable protective layer. Neither the Shank reference nor the Silvani et al reference supplies this missing element. Since the combination of Norman et al., Shank and Silvani et al. do not teach or suggest creating a durable protective layer in their patent, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established. As a result, Applicants contend that their claimed process is novel and unobvious and that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) should be withdrawn.

It is submitted that Claims 1-2, 20-22 and 31-43 are in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action on all claims is therefore requested.

If the next action is other than to allow the claims, the favor of a telephonic interview is requested with the undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,
Emmanuele Giacobbi et al.

By _____
Brent M. Peebles
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 38,576
(513) 627-6773

September 2, 2004
Customer No. 27752